RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

February 2004 Socio-economic Series 04-014

RESIDENTIAL INTENSIFICATION CASE STUDIES: BUILT PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

For the last 50 years, new development in Canada has typically occurred on greenfield lands at the urban edge, resulting in the loss of farmland and natural areas, rising car-dependency and traffic congestion. Moreover, many municipalities lack the resources to pay for the infrastructure needed to support expansion into greenfield areas.

One of the ways municipalities have sought to address these issues is through residential intensification, i.e., encouraging housing development in existing urban areas where infrastructure and transit services are already in place. Infill development, adaptive reuse, brownfield redevelopment, lot splitting and secondary suites are examples of intensification that can result in:

- reduced infrastructure costs
- increased housing opportunities
- more efficient land use
- preservation of rural and natural areas outside existing urban boundaries
- revitalization of urban areas in decline
- more transportation choice through easier access to daily destinations such as work, shopping and entertainment (e.g., mixed-use, pedestrian and transit-oriented neighbourhoods).

Intensification comes in myriad forms including: infill (building homes on small gaps in residential areas); redevelopment (mixed-use projects on large-scale sites); adaptive reuse (creating residential units by renovating existing non-residential buildings) and addition (adding residential units to existing buildings, such as secondary suites in single-family homes). These can be found in different settings, including mainstreets, brownfields, greyfields, waterfronts, downtowns and suburbs.

PURPOSE AND RESEARCH APPROACH

This project profiles examples of residential projects that have overcome the barriers to intensification and are generally considered to be successful by the developers, residents and municipal officials. The lessons learned about what worked and what didn't can be of use to developers, municipal officials and others looking for innovative solutions to overcoming these obstacles and realizing the many benefits of intensification.

The report profiles 23 completed intensification projects, summarized in Table 1. For each case study, the research team interviewed the developer, the municipal official most familiar with the project and a number of residents to get their perspectives on the project success, insights into how obstacles were overcome and general lessons learned.

FINDINGS

The 23 case studies demonstrate different approaches to successfully achieving residential intensification in a variety of circumstances. One thing was clear throughout the study—intensification faces a number of significant challenges and requires concerted effort

63440

CMHC SCHL

HOME TO CANADIANS
Canada

on the part of developers, their consultants and municipalities. Almost all the projects met with practical challenges, which can be grouped into the following general categories:

- higher development costs
- neighbourhood opposition
- regulatory issues.

As a result, developers of intensification projects are generally exposed to more financial risk, delays and complexities and, therefore, have to be more creative and perhaps more daring in response.

Despite the risks, there are rewards for those who succeed. These rewards come in the form of higher sale prices or rent as a result of better proximity to amenities and rapid sales as a result of pent-up demand for urban living and unique project attributes, such as heritage restoration. Also, with some large, high profile projects there is a measure of respect and prestige bestowed on developers who have wrestled with a large or challenging project—respect and prestige that helps attract buyers. However, the challenges in some cases can make the developer's return on investment unsatisfactory. The challenges include cost overruns for contamination cleanup, delays from regulatory hurdles and special design features included to ensure the project fits the neighbourhood.

To help developers overcome these challenges, many municipalities have introduced policy initiatives supportive of intensification. Indeed, some of the projects profiled in this report would not have been built without such support. Some of these initiatives are documented in a separate CMHC report entitled *Residential Intensification Case Studies: Municipal Initiatives*.

Higher development costs

A number of factors can limit the economic feasibility of intensification projects when compared with greenfield projects. These include:

- Higher construction costs due to upgrading and restoring heritage buildings, often with unforeseen issues with the existing building (Sterling Place, Western Elevator Lofts, The Prince Edward, Seagram Lofts, Salsbury Heights).
- Special design-architectural features in response to neighbourhood concerns about the project fitting in (The Carlings, Parkside Mews, Gower Gardens, Koo's Corner and many more).
- Cleanup costs on contaminated sites and the ongoing risk of liability even after development has been completed (London Lane, Angus, others).
- Extra costs of tight sites, including paying for road closures, crew parking, extra security, compensation to neighbouring property owners for blasting damage or overhead crane swings, higher insurance premiums, etc (Waterford Suites, Portland Park Village).
- Structural issues on reclaimed waterfront land (Convoy Quay, Bishop's Landing).
- Time delays caused by regulatory hurdles, public input and approvals process, which ultimately lead to cost increases for the developer.

How was this overcome?

Despite these obstacles, most developers were satisfied with the return on investment. The selling prices or rents for most of the projects were about the same as average prices and rents for similar housing types in the same city.

- In many cases there was large, pent-up demand, driven largely by the projects' excellent locations in close proximity to urban amenities. The projects often fulfilled demand where there was limited supply of new downtown housing (e.g., Sterling Place, Fifth Street Lofts, The Prince Edward, Western Elevator Lofts) and consumer taste for a unique product (Koo's Corner, Garrison Woods, Seagram Lofts). This resulted in rapid sales and a positive return on investment for many projects.
- Municipal support for the projects was key, generally motivated by the municipalities' desire to encourage intensification.
- Many of the larger redevelopment projects involved a close partnership with the municipality (Garrison Woods, Angus, Seagram Lofts), often with the municipality paying for a significant portion of infrastructure costs. In two cases, Bishop's Landing and Convoy Quay, provincial support and large-scale planning were key.
- Municipal incentive programs helped to ensure the financial feasibility of many of the projects. Incentives included:

  - financial assistance for heritage restoration and urban neighbourhood revitalization projects, including grants, tax credits, gap financing and interest-free loans, (Western Elevator Lofts, Sterling Place, Lofts Laliberté, Salsbury Heights, Fifth Street Lofts)
  - grants for cleanup of contamination, in two cases financed by the province, but administered by the City (Angus, Co-op du Couvent de Saint-Henri)
  - elimination or reduction of development charges (Parkside Mews, Seagram Lofts, London Lane)
- In many cases, the municipality was flexible and receptive to changing regulations such as zoning and parking, which helped reduce the cost from delays that can put projects in jeopardy. Some projects were allowed density increases in return for heritage restoration (Salsbury Heights, Sterling Place, Seagram Lofts). Flexibility on other issues, such as height, open space, parking and live-work units, also benefited many of the projects.
- Many developers did careful cost control (Lofts du Pont) and extensive research to establish requirements before embarking on the projects (Western Elevator Lofts).
- Although most of the projects studied were financed conventionally, some developers adopted more unusual, creative financing approaches. These included a co-housing model, where the future owners acted as the developer and collectively provided the equity necessary to obtain financing for the project (Cranberry Commons), and a project where future residents tied their RRSPs to their purchase in order to provide down payments, which were used to leverage more financing (The Prince Edward). In the case of London Lane, units were initially built as rent-to-own units to allow owners to build up some equity in the project before conversion to condominiums.

Neighbourhood opposition

There is often considerable opposition to intensification projects, frequently relating to perceived threats to property values, incompatible building scale or character, blocking of sunlight and views, as well as parking and traffic problems. Compared to greenfield development, neighbours are usually living closer to the projects and there is more interest in ensuring the project fits in because a unique architectural fabric has already been established. Neighbourhood opposition is usually most intense in well-established residential neighbourhoods surrounding infill projects. Certain municipalities, therefore, require a high standard of design and public process to ensure the project "fits" into the existing urban fabric.

How was this overcome?

- Neighbourhood support was fostered in some projects because the developer restored vacant heritage buildings that were valued by the neighbourhood (Seagram Lofts, The Prince Edward, Salsbury Heights). In other cases, the existing land use was considered to be undesirable by the neighbourhood, so the new development was seen as an improvement (Lofts du Pont, Waterford Suites, Co-op du Saint Henri). In other cases, projects were developed in commercial areas where there were few existing residential neighbours (Portland Park Village, Fifth Street Lofts).
- Many developers engaged in public consultation early, prior to formally submitting an application. Through open houses, forums or meetings with community groups, neighbours could voice their specific design concerns and there were opportunities for dialogue and for the developer to understand those concerns and modify the design (Renaissance, Bishop's Landing, Salsbury Heights, Gower Gardens, Seagrams Lofts, Parkside Mews, Koo's Corner). For some larger redevelopment projects, working groups or advisory committees were established to represent the neighbourhood and liaise with the developer (The Carlings, Garrison Woods, Angus). Generally, developers genuinely responded to local concerns and this was cited as a key success factor and ensured both municipal and neighbourhood support. Developer responses to concerns included incorporating:
  - Retail space and employment (Parkside Mews, Angus).
  - Materials and architectural detailing reflective of the neighbourhood (most projects, especially The Carlings, Parkside Mews, Koo's Corner).

- Reduced building heights and terracing to ensure a compatible scale and to avoid blocking views of neighbours (Bishop's Landing, Gower Gardens, The Carlings). Two building scales, like townhouses and taller apartment buildings, were used in some projects (Waterford Suites, Portland Park Village) for attractiveness and scale compatibility, while achieving sufficient density.
- Public amenity space (Bishop's Landing, The Carlings, Convoy Quay Gardens, Harmony).
- Traffic calming (Garrison Woods) and screened parking that allows pleasant streetscapes along public streets (Angus, Harmony, Portland Park). Many projects included underground parking.

- Some of the projects suffered in the early stages from public resentment left over from previous proposals by other developers (Parkside Mews, The Carlings). Having previously fought proposals they didn't care for, neighbours were wary of all development proposals. Developers in these situations had to be even more sensitive to neighbourhood concerns and manage the public process with extreme care.

Regulatory issues

Despite support offered by municipalities, many projects encountered complex or lengthy approvals processes that created time delays and cost overruns. Creative solutions, lengthy negotiations and compromises were needed to proceed. Requirements to fit in with the surrounding context require more careful design consideration.

In some cases, complex negotiations and time delays undermined financial performance, resulting in disappointing profits for the developers concerned. This was the case even when municipalities were supportive of the project and had policies encouraging intensification (Parkside Mews, London Lane, etc.). In others, developers made the modifications or negotiated alternatives and still made satisfactory return on investment.

Specific regulatory hurdles and solutions

- Adapting old buildings to modern building codes often requires extensive construction work that can make a project uncompetitive. Heritage façade restoration can also increase costs (Sterling Place, Western Elevator Lofts, The Prince Edward, Salisbury Heights, Seagram's Lofts). These projects can involve unforeseen building conditions that require upgrades, like sound and thermal insulation, ventilation and fire safety. Some municipalities have adopted a more flexible regulatory approach to these issues and/or provided financial incentives that tip the balance in favour of adaptive reuse rather than demolition (Western Elevator Lofts, Sterling Place). There were examples of developers negotiating code equivalencies to help reduce the costs of meeting the code. One developer recommends that when doing adaptive reuse, add 25 per cent contingency to anticipated costs due to unforeseen building conditions. Another says to be fully aware of all the heritage requirements before embarking on heritage restoration projects.
- Parking requirements can increase costs. For example, for Cranberry Commons the extra parking required by the City proved to be costly and unnecessary. However, many projects were able to obtain parking reductions or cash in lieu of parking.
- Most projects involved zoning modifications, including changing a land use, allowing additional density, increasing building heights and reducing building setbacks. Developers either conformed to the requirements or negotiated alternatives that were acceptable to the City and the neighbourhood, for example, allowing density increases for restoration of a heritage building (Salisbury Heights, Sterling Place, Seagram Lofts). Creative solutions were often required. For example, the Lofts du Pont townhouses are built on a laneway but the City requires that the address and main entrance to dwellings be on a street, not a lane. The developer, therefore, had to design the project so that the main entrance fronted onto the municipal street even though most of the project façade faced the lane.

- Some projects were required to adhere to design guidelines that dictate architectural style, streetscaping, etc. This was the case particularly for larger-scale projects, such as The Carlings, Garrison Woods and Angus.
- In some cases, this regulatory complexity resulted from contrasting visions between City departments, like those between engineering and planning regarding street standards (Garrison Woods, Angus). Developers recommend that proponents ensure that both the planning and engineering departments are supportive of the project before proceeding. If possible, they suggest obtaining detailed expressions of support for the project from the municipality. In some cases, staff disputes were only settled after council gave clear direction to staff to resolve conflicts through a compromise solution.
- Innovation often brings a higher quality product but can lead to more complicated approvals and regulatory roadblocks. Developers who went this route displayed a high level of personal interest and determination, which resulted in eventual success.

Resident satisfaction

Residents were generally very satisfied with their units and most had willingly traded off disadvantages, such as less green space, reduced parking and smaller unit size, for the benefits of convenient access to amenities and a high level of neighbourhood vitality. In some cases (Cranberry Commons, Koo's Corner) residents had purchased their units, in part, because of the environmental benefits of intensification projects.

Residents appreciated the efforts of most developers to provide good access to sunlight and to improve views through the use of large windows and careful unit orientation, and these were important factors in their purchasing decisions. Lack of parking, although the most frequently raised issue, was rarely a huge concern for residents. In fact, many residents accepted that reduced parking in the urban areas is both necessary and desirable.

As one would expect, the location and convenient access to amenities encouraged many residents to use alternatives to the car. In general, the percentage of residents using alternative forms of transportation (transit, bike, walk) was greater for these projects than in the Census Metropolitan Area as a whole.

Selling prices and rents, with a couple of exceptions, were similar to the average prices in the municipality for comparable housing types in the same year.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the challenges of developing residential intensification projects, many Canadian municipalities are witnessing a shift in the balance between greenfield development and intensification. Acting with the knowledge that there is a market demand for such projects, both municipalities and developers are becoming more creative in their attempts to incorporate additional residential units into existing urban areas. City programs are helping to remove the obstacles to intensification, e.g., contamination, renovation costs for heritage, DCCs and generally creating a supportive environment.

Despite initial neighbourhood concern about many of these projects, in none of the cases was lingering opposition noted by municipal officials. Issues were either non-existent, resolved in the design-approval stages or the neighbourhood has grown to like the project. In many cases, developers worked closely with neighbourhood groups to resolve issues by finding creative solutions. For example, in some cases, the public argued for non-residential uses to be included (Parkside Mews, Angus), which arguably resulted in a better project for all.

While residential intensification is well established and self perpetuating in some municipalities (Vancouver, Toronto), many medium- and small sized municipalities are still witnessing early attempts to intensify and they still struggle to reduce barriers.

From this study, it is clear that the challenges of intensification are numerous. However, through the concerted effort and partnership of developers and municipalities, and driven by an increased demand for urban living, residential intensification is providing good results for all those involved.

Table 1—Summary of built project case studies

Project name, developer	Municipality	Intensification type	Description	Completed	Pre-development use	Challenges	Lessons learned, success factors
Angus, Canadian Pacific Railway Real Estate Group	Montréal, Que.	Redevelopment (brownfield)	1,200 housing units: condo apartments and townhouses, seniors rental apartments (max. 8 storeys) plus commercial and industrial uses	Final phase 2006 -700 units built at time of study (2003)	Industrial rail yard complex	• Major soil contamination • Lengthy and complex public consultation process • Required to incorporate industrial and commercial uses • City departments lacked a shared vision	• Be flexible • Listen to the neighbourhood: find creative ways to include their desired features, e.g. included industrial, commercial uses • Meticulous planning, common understanding of goals and positive partnership with City in large projects will minimize delays • Grants for cleaning up contamination instrumental in helping to deal with cost disadvantage of brownfield sites
Bishop's Landing, Southwest Properties Ltd.	Halifax, N.S	Redevelopment (waterfront)	206 rental apartments (max. 7 storeys), retail uses at grade	2001	Surface parking lot	• Working efficiently with multiple government stakeholders • Neighbourhood opposition because of impact on views etc. • Approval decision was appealed to Supreme Court of Nova Scotia • Reclaimed land (underground parking issues)	• Having a crown corporation as a development partner improved visioning and approvals process • A good relationship with the municipality ensured solid support • A flexible design plan and a positive housing market made this project a success • Reduced height to avoid blocking views • Obtained City and neighbourhood support by including large, high quality public amenity space
Co-op du Couvent de Saint Henri, GRT Bâtir Son Quartier	Montréal, Que.	Adaptive reuse	48 co-op rental units (max. 4 storeys)	2000	Vacant school building	• Building asbestos removal required • Soil contamination from former industrial uses on site	• Project made possible by Accès Logis, a community housing subsidy program of the Quebec government • Land and building donated by City of Montréal • Soil remediation assisted by Revi-sols program
Convoy Quay Gardens, Provident Development Inc.	Bedford, N. S.	Redevelopment (waterfront)	91 condo apartments (max. 9 storeys)	2000	Industrial waterfront and reclaimed river basin	• Complexity of structural engineering on unstable, reclaimed land resulted in time delays and cost overruns	• Perseverance is key to overcoming setbacks (such as engineering problems) • Provincial support and large-scale waterfront planning were key to success • City and neighbourhood support gained by including large, high quality public amenity space
Cranberry Commons, Cranberry Commons Co-housing Development Corporation	Burnaby, B.C.	Infill (increasing density on existing residential lots)	22 condo units: townhouses and apartments (max 3½ storeys)	2001	5 single detached lots with 2 existing single-detached houses	• Extra costs of unnecessary municipal parking requirements • Extensive rezoning negotiations with municipality (setbacks, density, parking)	• Socially and environmentally progressive project appealed to municipality that approved density increase • Innovative design takes longer to approve and requires lengthy negotiations with the municipality

Table 1—Summary of built project case studies

Project name, developer	Municipality	Intensification type	Description	Completed	Pre-development use	Challenges	Lessons learned, success factors
Fifth Street Lofts, Five Oaks Developments	Edmonton, Alta.	Adaptive reuse (downtown revitalization)	39 condo loft-style apartments (max. 3 storeys)	1998	Nightclub in former textiles warehouse	• Asbestos removal • Project insurance difficult to obtain	• By building during the initial stages of a municipally designated intensification area policy, the land costs were still low, giving better returns • Providing unique product that was in limited supply resulted in fast sales and profits • City grant and no development charges helped make project more viable
Garrison Woods, Canada Lands Company	Calgary, Alta.	Redevelopment (suburban) and adaptive reuse (New Urbanist community development)	1,600 units: condo apartments, townhouses, semi-detached former military houses, single-detached houses, apartments above retail and coach house units plus retail (max. 4 storeys)	2003/4	Canadian Forces Base	• Convincing City engineers to accept customized street and park standards • Soil contamination • Public consultation process • Reusing former military houses	• Insist on timely and common sense approvals from government officials • Building what you envision takes extra time and effort • Cooperation between developers and government officials makes a much better product • Be flexible in incorporating neighbourhood wishes: advisory committee is a good way to communicate • Traffic calming and high streetscape quality (e.g., preserved mature trees)
Gower Gardens, Ken's Lucky Dollar Foods	Gibsons, B.C.	Adaptive reuse and infill (downtown revitalization)	11 condo townhouses and apartments plus retail (max. 4 storeys)	1998	Grocery store and parking lot	• Conforming to development permit guidelines • Gaining support from neighbourhood residents, e.g., blocking views	• Persistence is vital in these types of developments to balance requirements of municipality with project objectives • Having a single point of contact (development liaison) in the municipality would have made the development much smoother • Flexibility in incorporating neighbourhood concerns, like reduced height: terraced buildings to preserve views and scale
Harmony, Rockport Group	Toronto, Ont.	Infill/ redevelopment (suburban)	242 condo townhouses (max. 4 storeys)	1999	Vacant land	• Noise and aesthetic issues from nearby power lines • Major redesign needed due to a high groundwater table (no underground parking) and altered phasing requirements (needed to sell most attractive units first) • Gaining neighbourhood support re. traffic, safety, site access, parking • Awkward triangle-shape site bounded by busy arterials and hydro lines	• Success of infill projects comes down to careful planning, quality design and superior marketing skills • Infill projects also require a developer who is less averse to risk • Overcame sound issues through careful unit location/orientation and window placement • All parking, driveways in rear lanes, preserved safe and friendly streetscape on public roads • Public park in centre used up space that was difficult to develop

Table 1—Summary of built project case studies

Project name, developer	Municipality	Intensification type	Description	Completed	Pre-development use	Challenges	Lessons learned, success factors
Koo's Corner, Chesterman Property Group Inc.	Vancouver, B.C.	Adaptive reuse and infill (urban neighbourhood)	6 condo townhouses (max. 2½ storeys)	2002	Car repair shop and parking	• Struggled to reach agreement on responsibility for cleaning up contamination • Alleviating neighbour's concerns (re. density, character, façades, garages) • Fitting building and required parking onto very tight site • Integrating high density, ground oriented project into surrounding heritage community • Reusing existing building	• Early, open neighbourhood consultation needed to gain community and municipal support • Thoughtful design, colour selection, and massing to fit with heritage residential community and reflect commercial/industrial history of site • Green building features attracted buyers • Knowledgeable municipal urban designer and City's density bonus for building retention
Les Lofts du Pont, Les Développements Mas Inc.	Montréal, Que.	Infill (urban neighbourhood)	7 condo townhouses fronting a lane (max. 3 storeys)	2002	Vacant lot	• Conforming to municipal bylaws and guidelines regarding access onto laneways • Keeping costs low to keep prices within range of target market	• Smart site selection created a project where many would have seen none • Innovative design required to meet municipal bylaw requirements for lanes • Careful cost control kept prices within range of target market
Les Lofts Laliberté, Laliberté	Québec City, Que.	Adaptive reuse (downtown heritage revitalization)	51 rental apartments plus offices, and retained retail store (max. 6 storeys)	1999	Heritage department store	• Lack of resident parking • Costs of renovating heritage building	• Positive relationship between the developer and the municipality • Large municipal grants offset costs of heritage restoration
London Lane, Reid Heritage Homes	Guelph, Ont.	Redevelopment (brownfield, suburban)	105 units: condo townhouses and semi-detached houses (max. 2 storeys)	2001	Industrial land	• Soil contamination • Risk and cost of contaminated site • Site requirements resulting from close proximity to railway tracks	• Unforeseen costs can arise on brownfield projects • Environmental risk can never be fully eliminated • City allowed increased density in recognition of site challenges • City reduced DCCs for infill project
Parkside Mews, Domicile Developments Inc.	Ottawa, Ont.	Infill and adaptive reuse (urban neighbourhood)	31 freehold townhomes, 6 condo apartments, 8 retail units (max. 3 storeys)	1998	Florist (green-houses) and four residential buildings	• Making concessions to gain community support, e.g., including retail units • Conforming to government regulations and requirements, e.g. zoning, parking, rental protection Act, setbacks for snow and garbage removal	• Even an excellent plan and attractive features can be financially compromised by a lengthy, complex approvals process even when the municipality is supportive of the project. • Be flexible in incorporating neighbourhood concerns e.g. incorporated at grade retail as well as architectural features and scale of surroundings • City's elimination of development charges helped financially

Table 1—Summary of built project case studies

Project name, developer	Municipality	Intensification type	Description	Completed	Pre-development use	Challenges	Lessons learned, success factors
Portland Park Village, CityScape Development Corporation	Toronto, Ont.	Infill (downtown revitalization)	193 units: condo apartments and townhouses, plus retail (max. 9 storeys for apts. and 4 for townhouses)	2001	Parking lot	• Soil contamination • Construction on a small and tight site -access problems during construction	• In this case, reducing density to gain unique features and quality design was a successful strategy • High quality townhouses attracted buyers and made higher density apartments more viable • Parking, driveways in rear lanes preserves safe and friendly streetscape on public roads
Salsbury Heights, VHL Group Inc.	Vancouver, B.C.	Adaptive reuse and infill (heritage revitalization)	16 condo units: apartments, townhouses, single-detached houses (max. 35 ft. tall)	2001	Heritage house used as private hospital	• Working around heritage requirements • Gaining community support for increased density • Dealing with heritage renovation costs and time delays affordably	• Be aware that the heritage approval process is longer and more strict than usual • Make sure the heritage requirements are fully understood by doing preliminary research to determine a more accurate development schedule • Extra density was allowed in exchange for heritage restoration to help offset costs
Seagram Lofts, Barrel Works Group Ltd.	Waterloo, Ont.	Adaptive reuse (downtown heritage revitalization)	103 condo loft-style apartments (max. 10 storeys)	2001	Distillery warehouses for aging whisky	• Initial risk of large investment with no phased returns • Salvaging original brick and barrel wood • Working around heritage requirements	• Make sure the political and economic environment is conducive to your project vision • Shared visions and goals between the developer and municipality make for a faster and more rewarding project • City support by eliminating development charges, building an adjacent public park and extra density helped make project viable • Developers need to be dedicated and have real interest in their projects to be successful
Sterling Place, Spriet Associates	London, Ont.	Adaptive reuse (downtown, heritage revitalization)	32 rental apartments (max. 5½ storeys)	1999	Vacant commercial heritage building	• Selective demolition and residential retrofit • Anticipating building code conditions and having to adapt	• Make sure building code issues for old buildings are fully understood before the planning process starts • Providing unique product that was in limited supply resulted in fast sales and profits • City grants and programs offset heritage revitalization costs
The Carlings at Arbutus Walk, Concert Properties Ltd.	Vancouver, B.C.	Redevelopment (urban neighbourhood , brownfield)	100 condo apartments (max. 4 storeys-The Carlings).	1997	Molson Brewery	• Inherited neighbourhood concerns about height, density, character, scale, open space • Conforming to detailed guidelines of Neighbourhood Policy Plan	• Would have been preferable to be involved in the rezoning process • Be flexible and innovative in incorporating neighbourhood design concerns, e.g. height, architectural features, scale, public open space • Working groups and charrettes are good ways to enable communication and resolve design issues • Once neighbourhood support was obtained, subsequent phases went smoothly

Table 1—Summary of built project case studies

Project name, developer	Municipality	Intensification type	Description	Completed	Pre-development use	Challenges	Lessons learned, success factors
The Prince Edward, Prince Edward Developments Ltd.	Moncton, N.B.	Adaptive reuse (heritage revitalization)	18 rental, loft-style apartments (max. 3 storeys)	2000	Vacant school-house	• Arranging subdivision of lands with the municipality • Code issues in restoring old building	• Do not be discouraged by poor state of building; look forward to the quality finished product • Add up to 25% to the estimated construction budget to cover unanticipated costs of restoring heritage buildings
The Renaissance at North Hill, Apex Lifestyle Communications Inc.	Calgary, Alta.	Infill/ redevelopment (suburban, greyfield, transit-oriented.)	170 condo apartments (max. 10 storeys)	2003	Shopping centre parking lot	• No major obstacles	• Being up front, honest and communicating effectively with all partners greatly increases the success of a project
Waterford Suites, Ollive Properties	Halifax, N.S.	Redevelopment and infill (downtown revitalization)	77 rental apartments and townhouses (max. 8 storeys)	2001	Liquor store, warehouse and parking lot	• Construction difficulties on small, tight site • Finding parking for crews in busy downtown • Conforming to noise bylaws during construction caused delays	• Infill projects that have high site coverage pose many complex challenges that require acute planning and lots of determination to overcome • Townhouses along street blend in with adjacent buildings, while taller apartment set back from street enable increased density
Western Elevator Lofts, Exchange Lofts Inc.	Winnipeg, Man.	Adaptive reuse (downtown revitalization)	7 condo loft apartments (max. 4 storeys—will be 5)	2002	Vacant heritage commercial building	• Code issues for renovating heritage building • City was not used to dealing with this type of project	• Financial incentives from CentreVenture and City offset costs (grant, tax credit, etc.) • Having a single point of contact with the municipality would have facilitated a faster process • Unusual product in Winnipeg market helped with sales

Detailed case studies on all of these projects are available at www.cmhc.ca.

Project Manager: Susan Fisher

Research Consultant: Roberts Barrs,
Holland Barrs Planning Group Inc.

Housing Research at CMHC

Under Part IX of the *National Housing Act*, the Government of Canada provides funds to CMHC to conduct research into the social, economic and technical aspects of housing and related fields, and to undertake the publishing and distribution of the results of this research.

This fact sheet is one of a series intended to inform you of the nature and scope of CMHC's research.

To find more *Research Highlights* plus a wide variety of information products, visit our Web site at

www.cmhc.ca

or contact:

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
700 Montreal Road
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P7

Phone: 1 800 668-2642
Fax: 1 800 245-9274

OUR WEB SITE ADDRESS: www.cmhc.ca

Although this information product reflects housing experts' current knowledge, it is provided for general information purposes only. Any reliance or action taken based on the information, materials and techniques described are the responsibility of the user. Readers are advised to consult appropriate professional resources to determine what is safe and suitable in their particular case. CMHC assumes no responsibility for any consequence arising from use of the information, materials and techniques described.

60975